

On Quantum Scattering of a System with Internal Degrees of Freedom

A. H. Castro Neto^{1,2} and A.O. Caldeira^{2,3}

¹ *Institute for Theoretical Physics*

University of California

Santa Barbara, CA, 93106-4030

² *Department of Physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

1110 West Green Street, Urbana, Illinois, 61801-3080, U.S.A.

³ *Instituto de Física “Gleb Wataghin”*

Universidade Estadual de Campinas

13083-970 Campinas, SP, Brazil.

Abstract

We study the quantum tunnelling of a very complex object of which only part is coupled to an external potential (the potential barrier). We treat this problem as the tunnelling of a particle (part of the system affected by the potential) coupled to a “heat bath” (all of the remaining degrees of freedom) from the point of view of the wavefunction of the whole system. We obtain an effective scattering equation for this wavefunction which resembles the integral equation for the wavefunction of the particle in the absence of the bath. We show that the effect of the interaction is to renormalize the mass and the potential of the problem and that these new parameters can be solely described in terms of the spectral function of the excitations of the system.

PACS numbers: 03.65.-w, 05.30.-d, 05.40.+j, 03.65.Nk

The problem of the quantum mechanical tunnelling of non-isolated particles has been attracting a great deal of attention for over one decade now. People have been mainly interested in the so-called dissipative quantum tunnelling which turns out to be of crucial importance to problems involving either macroscopic quantum tunnelling [1] or macroscopic quantum coherence [2]. Although the mathematical details can vary from one problem to the other, the basic idea behind all of them is always the same. One tries to mimic the influence of a very complicated set of degrees of freedom by a set of non-interacting harmonic modes with an appropriate spectral function previously chosen [1–4]. The next step is to trace out these harmonic modes from the dynamical or equilibrium density operator of the whole system, depending on the problem one wants to attack, and use the so-called reduced density operator of the system in order to obtain the desired information.

The problem we want to face in this work is not of the same kind as the above-mentioned ones. What we are now interested in is the quantum tunnelling of a very complex system, say, a huge molecule or a very heavy nucleus, of which only a small set of variables can couple to an external potential. We prepare our complex system as a wave packet moving towards that barrier and ask the following question: “How do the extra modes (the ones not feeling the potential barrier) affect the transmission coefficient of the complex system as a whole?”

As an example, suppose we want to study the tunnelling of a very complex nucleus through a potential barrier of purely electromagnetic origin. In this case only the protons will feel the presence of the potential barrier although they will still be coupled to the neutrons via strong interaction. If there was no external potential, the total momentum of the system would be conserved. However, the presence of this barrier breaks the translation invariance of the problem and the nucleus will be either reflected or transmitted. This takes place through the motion of the protons which on their turn influence the motion of the neutrons. Therefore, the latter will ultimately affect the motion of the center of mass of the system and we can test it by studying the effective reflection and transmission coefficients of the nucleus as a whole.

In order to simplify matters and to keep away from intricate microscopic models we shall model our complex system as a particle (the relevant degrees of freedom) coupled to a bath (the complex set of internal excitations of the system) subject to a potential barrier acting only on the particle “coordinate”. The bath on its turn will be described by a set of non-interacting oscillators and due to our hypothesis of its high complexity we shall also define its spectral function and “internal temperature”.

Therefore, from now on, we shall be employing the same terminology as for the general problem of quantum dissipation bearing in mind that it should be taken seriously only in a very strict sense. We shall emphasize this remark whenever it is necessary.

Although stated in this way this problem resembles a lot the one of the transmission of a dissipative particle [5] they are not quite the same. For the latter the boundary condition must be entirely different from the one we shall be using in the present work. Here, the “system-plus- reservoir” move together in the same state of motion towards the barrier. It is clear that the presence of the external potential may cause “internal dissipation” due to the flow of energy from the particle to the bath. Nevertheless, the total energy of the system will be conserved.

It will be shown that the system tunnels as a particle with renormalized mass through a temperature dependent effective potential barrier. Moreover, the parameters of this effective scattering theory will be dependent only on the form of the spectral function of the internal excitations of the system.

Our approach in this article is quite different from the usual one for dealing with the quantum dynamics of non-isolated systems. Instead of treating the time dependent problem using path integrals we will use a time independent approach which resembles the problem of scattering by an external potential, in other words, we will write the time independent Schrödinger equation for $N + 1$ bodies in the approximation where the internal degrees of freedom act like a heat bath for the particle that feels the external potential.

Our starting point will be the well-known hamiltonian of a particle coupled linearly to N harmonic oscillators which is described as follows [3,6],

$$H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + V(x) - \sum_{i=1}^N C_i x_i x + \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{p_i^2}{2m_i} + \frac{m_i \omega_i^2 x_i^2}{2} + \frac{C_i^2 x^2}{2m_i \omega_i^2} \right) \quad (1)$$

where p and x , p_i and x_i , are the momentum and the coordinate of the particle and the oscillators, respectively, m is the “bare” mass of the particle, ω_i and m_i are the frequency and the mass of the i^{th} oscillator, respectively, C_i is the coupling constant between the particle and the oscillators and $V(x)$ is the external potential applied to the particle.

It was shown by Hakim and Ambegaokar [6] that the hamiltonian (1) can be diagonalized by a unitary transformation when there is no external potential ($V = 0$). In this case we obtain a hamiltonian where the center of mass of the whole system, particle plus oscillators, is decoupled from a new set of noninteracting oscillators. The diagonalized hamiltonian can be written as [6],

$$H' = U^\dagger H U = \frac{P^2}{2M} + \sum_j \hbar \Omega_j a_j^\dagger a_j \quad (2)$$

where U is a unitary transformation, P is the momentum of the center of mass of the system and M is the renormalized mass of the system which is given by,

$$M = m + \sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j \quad (3)$$

with

$$\mu_j = \frac{C_j^2}{m_j \omega_j^4}.$$

The operators $a_j^\dagger$ and a_j are the creation and annihilation operators for the new harmonic modes with frequency Ω_j which are solutions of the equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{C_i^2}{m m_i \omega_i^2 (\Omega_j^2 - \omega_i^2)} = 1.$$

The connection with the dissipative problem can be made if we introduce the spectral function of the oscillators,

$$J(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\pi C_i^2}{2 m_i \omega_i} \delta(\omega - \omega_i) \quad (4)$$

which in the ohmic regime is described by [3],

$$J(\omega) = \eta \omega \Theta(\omega_c - \omega)$$

where η is the damping coefficient and ω_c is the cut-off frequency of the bath. However, one should notice that this kind of assumption for the behavior of the spectral function is not appropriate for the present problem.

Observe that in infinite systems the total mass M , eq. (3), may diverge depending on the behavior of (4) at low frequencies. This shall not be the case for the sort of systems in which we are interested in this paper. We shall restrict ourselves to finite systems and these are bound to present a gap in their spectrum of excitations. In other words, the spectral function (4) will always have a natural low frequency cutoff.

In order to proceed further we include the external potential in the problem. Following the route established in ref. [6] we include a new term in (2) which is given by $U^\dagger V U$ where

$$U = e^{-p \sum_j K_j (a_j^\dagger - a_j)} \quad (5)$$

with

$$K_j = \sum_{l=1}^N \frac{\mu_l \Omega_j^{1/2}}{(2\hbar)^{1/2} M (\Omega_j^2 - \omega_l^2)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mu_i \omega_i^2}{(\Omega_j^2 - \omega_i^2)^2} \right)^{-1/2} \quad (6)$$

or in terms of the coordinates of the new oscillators we have

$$U^\dagger V U = V \left(X - \sum_{j=1}^N \sqrt{2\hbar\mu_j\Omega_j} K_j x_j \right), \quad (7)$$

where X is the position of the center of mass of the system.

Equations (6) and (7) show that the center of mass is coupled to the renormalized oscillators via the external potential. Suppose now that the potential has a finite range, in other words, it is a potential barrier. Moreover, since there are no modes of very low frequencies in the problem, there will always be a region for X sufficiently far from the origin where (7) vanishes. Therefore, outside the scattering region we have a free particle with mass M and momentum $\hbar q$ and a set of decoupled harmonic oscillators in states described by occupation numbers $\{N_j\}$. This is a scenario for scattering since we already know the asymptotic states of the problem. This is not revealed in our original hamiltonian (1).

The most natural way to solve this problem is to rewrite the time independent Schrödinger equation in the representation of the momentum of the particle and the Fock space of the oscillators. Adding (7) to (2) and writing the resulting equation in this representation together with the above-mentioned incoming condition, we easily get

$$\Psi_E(k, \{n_j\}) = \delta(k - q) \prod_{j=1}^N \delta_{n_j, N_j} - \sum_{k', \{n'_i\}} \frac{G(k - k')_{\{n_j\}, \{n'_i\}} V(k - k') \Psi_E(k', \{n'_i\})}{\frac{\hbar^2}{2M}(k^2 - q^2) + \sum_j \hbar \Omega_j (n_j - N_j)} \quad (8)$$

where Ψ_E is the wave function of $N + 1$ bodies with total energy $E = \frac{\hbar^2 q^2}{2M} + \sum_j \hbar \Omega_j N_j$, $V(k)$ is the Fourier transform of the potential and finally,

$$G(k - k')_{\{n_j\}, \{n'_i\}} = \langle \{n_j\} | U^\dagger(k) U(k') | \{n'_i\} \rangle \quad (9)$$

is the thermal part of the kernel of equation (8) where U is defined in (5). Observe that the effect of the external potential is completely separated from the coupling to the oscillators which is present only in (9). This remarkable fact will allow us to study the problem independently of the form of the external potential.

Notice that when the interaction is turned off, that is, $C_i = 0$, we have $U = I$ where I is the identity operator. Therefore, $G(k - k')_{\{n_i\}, \{n'_j\}} = \delta_{\{n_i\}, \{n'_j\}}$ and the solution is given by

$$\Psi_E(k, \{n_i\}) = \psi_q^B(k) \delta_{\{n_i\}, \{N_j\}} \quad (10)$$

where ψ^B obeys the “bare” scattering equation

$$\psi_q^B(k) = \delta(q - k) - \frac{1}{\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}(k^2 - q^2)} \sum_{k'} V(k - k') \psi_q^B(k') \quad (11)$$

as expected.

The solution of eq. (8) can be very difficult depending on the shape of the external potential (as in the problem without dissipation, eq. (11)). The presence of the kernel (9) creates new problems since it contains all induced transitions between the states of the oscillators due to the recoil of the core particle. We would like to mention that there is a formal solution for (8) for the case of local interactions ($V(x) = \alpha\delta(x)$) but the solution is not illuminating due to its complexity

Our approach here is to suppose that there is a huge number of normal modes and they are in thermal equilibrium. Notice that we are by no means planning to model the internal modes of our complex system as an infinite reservoir. By thermal equilibrium we only mean a fixed average energy which allows us to define a parameter, the “internal temperature”, we shall loosely refer to as simply temperature. What we aim at with this approximation is to have the system of oscillators being only very weakly influenced by the recoil of the particle. Although this hypothesis is more reasonable for high temperatures we shall assume it is also the case at very low temperatures. We then replace (9) by its average value in thermal equilibrium which is given by,

$$G(k)_{\{n_i\}, \{n_j\}} = \delta_{\{n_i\}, \{n_j\}} < G(k) >_T \quad (12)$$

where

$$< G(k) >_T = \frac{\text{tr}_R \left(e^{-\beta H_R} G(k) \right)}{\text{tr}_R \left(e^{-\beta H_R} \right)} \quad (13)$$

where tr_R means the trace over the reservoir coordinates, H_R is the bath hamiltonian given by the last term on the r.h.s. of (2) and $\beta = (K_B T)^{-1}$ where T is temperature (K_B is the Boltzmann constant).

If we substitute (12) in (8) we find the effective scattering equation for the center of mass,

$$\psi_q(k) = \delta(k - q) - \frac{1}{\frac{\hbar^2}{2M}(k^2 - q^2)} \sum_{k'} V^{eff}(k - k', T) \psi_q(k') \quad (14)$$

where

$$V^{eff}(k, T) = V(k) < G(k) >_T \quad (15)$$

is the effective potential felt by a “dressed” particle with mass M . Now the kernel of the scattering equation depends on the temperature and the coupling. The solution of (14) will provide us with the reflection and transmission coefficients for the scattering of the particle in the presence of a large set of internal degrees of freedom. It is worth mentioning that the wave function ψ *is not* the wave function for the bare particle but *it is* the effective wave function for the particle dragging the surroundings in its motion.

We can evaluate the thermal part of the kernel given in (13). We can show, after some straightforward, but lengthy, algebra that

$$< G(k) >_T = e^{-\Gamma(T)k^2} \quad (16)$$

where

$$\Gamma(T) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_j K_j^2 (1 + 2\bar{n}_j), \quad (17)$$

and

$$\bar{n}_j = \frac{1}{e^{\beta\hbar\Omega_j} - 1}$$

is the Bose occupation number.

If we substitute (16) in (15) and transform the problem to real space we find that the effective potential is written as

$$V^{eff}(X, T) = \int dX' V(X') \Delta(X - X', T) \quad (18)$$

where

$$\Delta(X, T) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi\Gamma(T)}} e^{-\frac{X^2}{4\Gamma(T)}} \quad (19)$$

and therefore if the interaction is turned off ($\Gamma \rightarrow 0$) we obtain the result that the effective potential is exactly the bare potential ($\lim_{\Gamma \rightarrow 0} \Delta(X, T) = \delta(x)$).

First, we note that the area under the potential is conserved,

$$S = \int dx V^{eff}(x) = \int dx V(x) \quad (20)$$

as we can easily check. Moreover, it is easy to show that the height of the potential is a monotonic decreasing function of $\Gamma(T)$. Since the area is conserved we conclude that the width of the potential must increase.

As an illustration of our results consider the simple case of a gaussian potential,

$$V(x) = V_0 \exp \left\{ -\frac{x^2}{a^2} \right\}. \quad (21)$$

It is very easy to obtain from (18) that the effective potential is given by,

$$V^{eff}(x) = \frac{V_0}{\sqrt{1 + 4\frac{\Gamma^2}{a^2}}} \exp \left\{ -\left(1 + 4\frac{\Gamma^2}{a^2}\right)^{-1} \frac{x^2}{a^2} \right\}. \quad (22)$$

Observe that the effect of interaction was to decrease the height of the potential and increase its width accordingly (see equation (20)). Indeed we have,

$$\frac{V(0)}{V^{eff}(0)} = \frac{\langle x \rangle_{eff}}{a} = \sqrt{1 + 4\frac{\Gamma^2}{a^2}}. \quad (23)$$

The effect on the transmission coefficient is readily obtained. From energy conservation we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \hbar q &= \sqrt{2M(E - E_T)}; \\ \hbar \kappa &= \sqrt{2M(V_{eff}(0) - E + E_T)}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where E is the total energy of the system whereas $E_T = \sum_j \hbar \Omega_j \bar{N}_j$ stands for its internal energy. For temperatures such that $\kappa a \gg 1$, we can show that the transmission is given by,

$$|t|^2 \simeq 16 \left(\frac{k\kappa}{k^2 + \kappa^2} \right)^2 e^{-4\kappa \langle x \rangle_{eff}}. \quad (25)$$

The exponent of the transmission coefficient in (25) can be easily analyzed if we write it as

$$4\kappa \langle x \rangle_{eff} = 4\sqrt{2MV_0a^2} \sqrt{\sqrt{1 + 4r^2} - (1 + 4r^2)} f \quad (26)$$

where $r = \Gamma/a$, $f = E_K/V_0$ and $E_K = E - E_T$ which is the energy of the center of mass of the system. Observe that we have two effects to take into account in (26). The increase of the effective mass, M , of the particle and its dependence on the parameter r .

The mass dependence has an obvious influence on the transmission coefficient because (26) monotonically increases with it. Therefore the transmission will steadily decrease as a function of the effective mass which is an expected result.

On the other hand, the dependence of the transmission coefficient on the combination of the effective height and width of the potential is not so simple. For a given spectral function one can compute the minimum effective range of the potential by using (17) for $T = 0$. This provides us with the minimum value of r since Γ is an increasing function of temperature. Now, it is worth noticing that (26) has a maximum at $1/4f$ and vanishes at $1/2f$ when $f \ll 1$. Therefore one can say that as the coupling is switched on there is a reduction of $|t|^2$ as compared to its non-interacting value. Furthermore, as one increases the temperature there is first a reduction of the transmission coefficient before it starts to increase to its maximum value. Actually we are assuming that in the limit of small f expression (25) is a good approximation for any value of $r_{min} < r < 1/2f$. Actually, this is true because in this range $\kappa a > 1$.

One can therefore conclude that the effect of the coupling to the internal degrees of freedom of the system tends to reduce its rate of transmission through potentials barriers. Actually there is a competition between this effect and the one related to the decrease of the potential barrier seen by the system as its center of mass kinetic energy is increased. The latter wins when $1/4f < r < 1/2f$ and this causes the transmission coefficient to increase in this region of energy.

This result is in agreement with those obtained in the study of dissipative quantum tunnelling and coherence [1,2] which say that the coupling of the form (1) to a heat bath inhibits quantum mechanical effects. Actually at this point one should be really tempted to draw some conclusions about dissipative quantum transmission from the results we have got in this paper. However, although we think that the final results for the latter will not differ much from the present ones, the reader should be warned that the boundary conditions appropriate to that problem are completely different from the one we used here and, in fact, it is not even clear to us whether model (1) in its present form should be the one to describe this phenomenon. The application of our present results with a spectral function $J(\omega) = \alpha\omega^n$ should be very carefully interpreted since we are treating only finite *environments* in this work. It would only make sense for very large n since in this way we should be trying to simulate a gap in the spectrum of excitations of the system.

In conclusion, we have derived an effective scattering equation for a particle coupled to a large, but finite, set of oscillators (internal degrees of freedom) which resembles the scattering equation for an isolated particle. We found that the main effects in the scattering problem are the increase of the mass due to the dragging of the oscillators and a change in the scattering potential which depends on the temperature and $J(\omega)$ (through the coupling

constants of the problem). We showed that the results for high and thin barriers can be obtained independently of the specific form of the bare external potential and they imply in the reduction of the transmission coefficient for tunnelling at low center of mass energies. The main assumption in our derivation is that the oscillators retain their thermal equilibrium during the scattering process.

A. H. Castro Neto gratefully acknowledges M. P. Gelfand and A. J. Leggett for useful comments, F. Guinea for illuminating discussions, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico, CNPq (Brazil), for a scholarship. A. O. Caldeira also wishes to acknowledge the support from the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico, CNPq (Brazil). This work was partially supported by the National Science Foundation through grants no. PHY 89-04035 and DMR 92-14236.

REFERENCES

- [1] A.O.Caldeira and A.J.Leggett, Ann.Phys. (NY) **149**, 374, (1983).
- [2] A.J.Leggett, S.Chakravarty, A.T.Dorsey, M.P.A.Fisher, A.Garg, and W.Zwerger, Rev.Mod.Phys. **59**, 1, (1987).
- [3] A.O.Caldeira and A.J.Leggett, Physica (Amsterdam) **121 A**, 587, (1983); **130 A**, 374(E), (1985).
- [4] R.P.Feynman and F.L.Vernon, Ann.Phys. (NY), **24**, 118, (1963).
- [5] R.Bruinsma and Per Bak, Phys.Rev.Lett, **56**, 420, (1986).
- [6] V.Hakim and V.Ambegaokar, Phys.Rev.A **32**, 423, (1985).
- [7] A.H.Castro Neto, unpublished.